# United States District Court

### WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

### **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

V

## ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

JAMES MARSHALL WEST	Case Number: 1:09-mj-20

JAW	IE3	IVIARSHALL WEST	1100 mj 20
requir	In ac	accordance with the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C.§3142(f), a dete e detention of the defendant pending trial in this case.	ention hearing has been held. I conclude that the following facts
•		Part I - Findings	s of Fact
	(1)	The defendant is charged with an offense described in 1	8 U.S.C. §3142(f)(1) and has been convicted of a (federal al offense if a circumstance giving rise to federal jurisdiction had
		a crime of violence as defined in 18 U.S.C.§3156(a)(4)	).
		an offense for which the maximum sentence is life im	·
		an offense for which the maximum term of imprisonr	ment of ten years or more is prescribed in
		a felony that was committed after the defendant had be U.S.C.§3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable state or local	een convicted of two or more prior federal offenses described in 18 offenses.
	(2)	The offense described in finding (1) was committed while the offense.	defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state or local
	(3)		te of conviction) (release of the defendant from imprisonment) for
	(4)	Findings Nos. (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebuttable presumpti assure the safety of (an)other person(s) and the commu presumption.	on that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably nity. I further find that the defendant has not rebutted this
		Alternate Findin	gs (A)
Ш	(1)	There is probable cause to believe that the defendant has	committed an offense
		for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten ye under 18 U.S.C.§924(c).	ears or more is prescribed in
	(2)	The defendant has not rebutted the presumption establishe reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as req	d by finding 1 that no condition or combination of conditions will uired and the safety of the community.
	(4)	Alternate Findin	gs (B)
	(1) (2)	There is a serious risk that the defendant will not appear.  There is a serious risk that the defendant will endanger the	safety of another person or the community.
		defendant had a somewhat mixed record. He obtained his for refusing to obey an order and being insolent in July 2004 of drugs in December 2004, use of drugs in May 2005, assa	er completing a 5 year sentence for drugs. (While in prison, the GED but failed to complete drug counseling. He was sanctioned 4, possession of an unauthorized item in July 2004, possession aulting without serious injury in December 2005, and possession February 2007, defendant was assigned to a Special Housing incidents (continued on attachment)
		Part II - Written Statement of R	easons for Detention
d that t	he cı	credible testimony and information submitted at the hea	ring establishes by clear and convincing evidence that
ecord o	of mis	isbehavior before, during, and following his prison term he has had positive opportunities (for example, quitting	he safety of the community based upon the defendant's  Defendant has repeatedly exercised poor judgment, the 500 hour drug program in prison, failing to continue to y, and repeated poor choices (continued on attachment)
		Part III - Directions Rega	arding Detention
acility s efendar r on rec	eparant nt sha nuest	rate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or se pall be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultati	or his designated representative for confinement in a corrections erving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The ion with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States of the corrections facility shall deliver the defendant to the United ourt proceeding.
Dated:	Ar	pril 14, 2009	/s/ Hugh W. Brenneman, Jr.
Daieu.	<u>- 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Signature of Judicial Officer
			Hugh W. Brenneman, United States Magistrate Judge
		-	Name and Title of Judicial Officer

United States v. **JAMES MARSHALL WEST** 1:09-mj-20

### ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

Page 2.

#### **Alternate Findings (B) - (continued)**

were reported during the intervening year. However, the following month, on March 15, 2007, defendant allegedly stabbed another prisoner with a homemade shank. Notwithstanding all of this, he received a good conduct release from prison in August 2008.) His behavior while on supervised release since that time has been abysmal.

In October 2008, the Lansing police seized 93 ecstacy tablets from his bedroom. He was subsequently charged with retail fraud in the 56th District Court, the 65-A District Court, and the 54-B District Court. (This court elected to take no action on these allegations until the cases were disposed of.)

On February 23, 2009, defendant tested positive for THC metabolite (this court again elected to take no action to allow defendant to participate in relapse substance abuse counseling and watch a TV series called Intervention). Defendant failed to contact this drug program.

On March 27, 2009, defendant again tested positive for THC metabolite. He was again directed to contact relapse counseling.

On April 1, 2009, defendant tested positive for cocaine, and has admitted this use.

On April 2, 2009, defendant was arrested by the FBI on a two-count federal Indictment out of the District of Kansas arising out of a prison stabbing while defendant was a prisoner in Leavenworth.

Defendant's sister, who has her master's degree in social work, testified that the defendant grew up in an horrific environment (she was apparently pulled out of the home as a child), and she offered to let the defendant live with her.

### **Part II - Written Statement of Reasons for Detention - (continued)**

concerning his behavior following release from prison). Defendant's inability to conform his behavior to societal norms may be due in part to his substance abuse problem, but that fact would make him no less a danger to continue committing offenses and using drugs as things presently stand. If defendant does not have a drug problem, then he is simply flouting the law for whatever benefit it brings him. If the matter was entirely in the hands of his sister, defendant would be a different person. But as she candidly admitted, she was not aware of much of his misbehavior and in any event she cannot live his life for him, or force him to make better decisions, even though she would want to do all she could for him. She will be a tremendous asset for him at such time as he demonstrates he is able of his own volition to turn his life around and make better choices. Unfortunately, he is far from that point at the present.